

REMARKS

In the last Office Action, restriction was required between Invention I, claims 1-32, drawn to a combination, and Invention II, claims 33-40, drawn to an identification system. The Examiner stated that the inventions are distinct from one another thereby making restriction proper. In addition, the Examiner required restriction between patentably distinct Species 1-4 within each of Inventions I and II and required that one species be elected for further prosecution.

In response to the restriction and election requirements, applicants provisionally elect the invention of Invention I and list claims 1-32 as being readable on the elected invention and elect Species 1 drawn to Figs. 1, 2 and 5 and list claims 1-32 as being readable on the elected species. Applicants further note that claims 1-9, 12, 14-27 and 30-32 are generic to all species. Thus upon the allowance of claims 1-9, 12, 14-27 and 30-32 or other generic or sub-generic claims, the election of species requirement should be withdrawn as to species claims readable on the allowable generic or sub-generic claims.

Early and favorable action are respectfully
requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ADAMS & WILKS
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Bruce L. Adams
Reg. No. 25,386


17 Battery Place
Suite 1231
New York, NY 10004
(212) 809-3700

MAILING CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

Thomas Tolve

Name



Signature

NOVEMBER 29, 2006

Date